



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.				
09/823,769	03/31/2001	Anil K. Annadata	M-11527 US	6443				
60975 CSA LLP 4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS RD. BLDG. 4, SUITE 201 AUSTIN, TX 78759	7590 05/29/2007		<table border="1"><tr><td colspan="2">EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">REFAI, RAMSEY</td></tr></table>		EXAMINER		REFAI, RAMSEY	
EXAMINER								
REFAI, RAMSEY								
			<table border="1"><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td></tr><tr><td>3627</td><td></td></tr></table>	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	3627		
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER							
3627								
			<table border="1"><tr><td>MAIL DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>05/29/2007</td><td>PAPER</td></tr></table>	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	05/29/2007	PAPER	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE							
05/29/2007	PAPER							

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/823,769	Applicant(s) ANNADATA ET AL.	
	Examiner Ramsey Refai	Art Unit 3627	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,5-21,24-34 and 37-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2,5-21,24-34 and 37-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 3627

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

Responsive to Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed March 6, 2007. Claims 2, 6-21, 25-34, 37-46 and 49-54 have been amended. Claims 2, 5-21, 24-34, and 37-55 are pending examination.

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- In the remarks, the Applicant argues in substance:

Argument A: *Dilip et al fail to teach a configurable communication server configured to access information regarding the type of communication that uses the communication channel since the final office action equates Dilip's transaction controller with the claimed communication channel and not the claimed communication server.*

In response, the Examiner has now equated the transaction controller with the claimed communication server, which now clearly teaches the claimed feature of a configurable communication server configured to access information regarding the type of communication that uses the communication channel. Dilip et al teach that the transaction controller determines how to handle the transaction by analyzing the transaction to identify the content of the transaction. The transaction controller handles multiple types of transactions such as email, video sessions, telephone calls, etc. The transaction is determined in order to appropriately respond to transaction or to determine the appropriate server to send the transaction. The transaction controller then provides information to the server regarding the manner in which the received transaction should be handled. (See column 9, line 23-column 10, line 35) The transaction controller can also obtain information regarding the transaction from the appropriate transaction

Art Unit: 3627

controller (column 9, lines 57-67). Therefore Dilip et al meets the scope of the claimed limitation.

Argument B: *Dilip et al ' s transaction controller performs the purported information accessing regarding the type of communication from the communication itself and not a memory storing data related to the communication channel.*

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The transaction controller contains a transaction analysis system that includes an inference engine that analyzes a transaction to determine the content of the transaction. The information is then used to route the transaction to the appropriate agent or group of agents. The transaction controller inherently contains memory, which contains logic that interprets the obtained information into instructions that route the transaction accordingly. (See column 8, lines 35-58). Rejection is maintained.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 2, 5-21, 24-34, and 37-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dilip et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,704,409).

4. As per claim 2, Dilip et al teach an apparatus for communicating using a communication channel comprising: a configurable communication server (Figure 2; transaction controller) configured to communicate via a communication channel (figure 2, transaction processing system)

Art Unit: 3627

by virtue of being configured to access information regarding a type of communication that uses the communication channel (Fig 5 element 130 – 134, column 9, lines 23–54, column 8, lines 35–59; determine type of transaction and how to handle the transaction ), determine a command to issue to the communication channel to cause an outgoing communication to be sent if the type of communication is outgoing (column 4, lines 5–54; transactions can be inbound or outbound).; and determine an event response to perform in response to an event if the type of communication is incoming(column 3, lines 25–52, fig 4 element 104, 112; communicates incoming transaction to appropriate system) wherein the information is accessed from a memory storing data corresponding to a configuration of the communication channel (column 8, lines 35–57; inference engine analyzes transaction to determine how and where to route the transaction).

5. As per claim 5, Dilip et al teach an apparatus comprising:

a database comprising an event record, wherein the event record comprises the information regarding the event (column 6, lines 43–48, column 5, lines 35–44; database stores data regarding transactions handles in system.).

6. As per claim 6, Dilip et al teach an apparatus wherein the configurable communication server is configured by performing one of adding the event record to the database, modifying the event record in the database, and deleting the event record from the database (column 6, lines 43–58, column 8, lines 61–67, column 5, lines 35–44).

7. As per claim 7, Dilip et al teach an apparatus comprising: at least one event handler and wherein the event record comprises a name of one event handler of the at least one event handler for handling the event and the configurable communication server uses the one event handler named in the event record for handling the event (Figure 2, column 3, lines 48–67, column 9, lines 23–67).

Art Unit: 3627

8. As per claim 8, Dilip et al teach an apparatus wherein the database further comprises an event response record associated with the event record; and the configurable communication server is further configured to determining the event response by accessing the event response record associated with the event record (column 5, lines 35-44, column 9, lines 23-67).

9. As per claim 9, Dilip et al teach an apparatus wherein the information regarding the event further comprises information regarding the event response; and the configurable communication server is further configured to perform the event response (Figure 2, column 3, lines 48-67, column 9, lines 23-67).

10. As per claim 10, Dilip et al teach an apparatus wherein the configurable communication server is coupled to a channel driver such that the channel driver communicates with the communication channel (Figure 2; the use of drivers are well known in the art and are inherent when using multiple communication channels that each use different protocols. The use of drivers would free the operating system from the burden of having to understand and support the needs of individual channels).

11. As per claim 11, Dilip et al teach an apparatus wherein the configurable communication server is coupled to the channel driver such that the configurable communication server receives the event from the communication channel via the channel driver (Figure 2; the use of drivers are well known in the art and are inherent when using multiple communication channels that each use different protocols. The use of drivers would free the operating system from the burden of having to understand and support the needs of individual channels).

12. As per claim 12, Dilip et al teach an apparatus comprising: a user interface comprising a user interface object capable of providing a notification of the event received from the communication channel (Figure 1).

Art Unit: 3627

13. As per claim 13, Dilip et al teach an apparatus comprising: a user interface comprising a user interface object capable of being activated, wherein the configurable communication server is configured to send the outgoing communication to the communication channel when the user interface object is activated (Figure 1)

14. As per claim 14, Dilip et al teach an apparatus wherein: the configurable communication server is configured to send the outgoing communication by issuing the command to the communication channel (column 4, lines 4-54).

15. As per claims 15-21, 24-34, and 37-53, these claims contain similar limitations as claims 2 and 5-14 above, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

16. As per claim 54, Dilip et al the communication server is further configured to access from a database the information regarding the type of communication that uses the communication channel (column 9, lines 55-67; transaction server communicates information about the received transaction to the transaction controller).

17. As per claim 55, Dilip et al teach wherein the database comprises one or more of: information regarding a channel driver associated with the communication channel; a media type associated with the communication channel, a media string used by the configuration server at run time to invoke a media service for the channel driver; one or more channel parameters (column 9, lines 63-67), and a default value for each of the one or more channel driver parameters.

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramsey Refai whose telephone number is (571) 272-3975. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00 p.m..

Art Unit: 3627

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on (571) 272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ramsey Refai  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3627  
May 18, 2007  
/RR/

  
F. RYAN ZEENDER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

5/18/07